



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20230

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

6-1/2

DATE MAILED:

**EXAMINER INTERVIEW SUMMARY RECORD**

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Examiner Matthew Grumbling (GAU 1202) (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Attorney Maria Mathias (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of interview: 11/30/1995

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached with respect to some or all of the claims in question. ☐ was not reached.

Claims discussed: 1-3, 6-7, 10-11

Identification of prior art discussed: None

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

**See Attached**

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

- ☒ 1. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph below has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW (e.g., items 1-7 of the second page of this form). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, then applicant is given one month from this interview date to provide a statement of the substance of the interview.

- ☐ 2. Since the examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the substance of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Matthew V. Grumbling  
Examiner's Signature

FILE COPY

Art Unit: 1202

Substance of the Interview

The examiner initiated the interview in order to clarify the issue regarding the rejection of claims 1-3, 6-7 and 10-11 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph for failure to teach how to make the claimed invention. Attorney Marla Mathias stated that the response filed 9/15/1995 was urging that the starting materials for the 4-pyrazinyl species would be readily available and would be expected to react just as the carbon-bonded indolyl, imidazolyl, etc. Upon careful consideration of example 2 in the specification, it can be seen that preparation of the 4-pyrazinyl species should progress analogously to the 3-pyridinyl species. Applicant's attorney also indicated that the modifying phrase "bonded at a five-membered ring carbon atom" is intended to refer to both 1H-indolyl and 1H-imidazolyl. The examiner's previous objection to this language is therefore rendered moot.

*Matthew V. Grumling*  
MATTHEW V. GRUMLING  
PATENT EXAMINER  
GROUP 1200

30 November 1995